

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 30 remain in this application. Claims 16 through 30 are allowed, and claims 1 through 15 remain rejected. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 7,079,945 to Kaplan ("Kaplan") in view of USPN 7,126,583 to Breed ("Breed").

Independent claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a plurality of surrounding cells representing areas surrounding the wireless communication device, each surrounding cell having an appearance representing to a video, audio or video/audio coverage capability provided by a sensor of a wireless media device within the respective surrounding cell. Independent claim 6 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a display configured to visually provide a representation of the video, audio or video/audio coverage capability of each area surrounding the wireless communication device provided by the at least one sensor of the surrounding devices. Independent claim 11 as amended provides, *inter alia*, providing a visual representation of the video, audio or video/audio coverage capability of each area surrounding the wireless communication device provided by the at least one sensor of the at least one surrounding device in each area. Support for the above added recitation is provided at page 16, line 11, through page 17, line 4; and page 17, line 19, through page 18, line 14, of the specification.

The above Office Action states that Kaplan does not teach the one of the available services can be the availability of TV broadcasts, but Breed teaches the use of a display system for a car that receives data for several types of services including weather, GPS, Traffic, and video in the form of a TV broadcast. However, in contrast to independent claims 1, 6 and 11 amended, Breed describes a display system that provides a TV broadcast. Breed does not describe or suggest any type of visual representation of a video, audio or video/audio coverage capability provided by a sensor of a wireless device within a surrounding area, as required by claims 1, 6 and 11 as amended. Therefore claims 1, 6 and 11 distinguish from Kaplan, Breed and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 5, 7 through 10 and 12 through 15 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, claims 2 through 5, 7 through 10 and

12 through 15 distinguish from Kaplan, Breed and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claims 1, 6 and 11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 through 15 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 02/18/2010
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350